

Crum

Response to Office Action dated January 6, 2009

**REMARKS**


Claim 21 remains in the case.

The rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Lalande in view of Good, Rea and MSDS is respectfully traversed. In discussing Good, the Examiner concedes that "Lalande modified by Good does not disclose" an adhesive arrangement in which "upon removing said major portions of said tags from said laminate, said major portion separates from said laminate free of adhesive but said minor portion remains adhered to said carrier sheet". In that respect, the Examiner's attention is drawn to Good's Fig. 4, which shows that his adhesive 19 underlies only the right half of the label portion 12. Consequently, the hanging region 14 (the "major portion") is not adhered at all to the release liner 17. Likewise, the "minor portion" 15 either comes with the region 14, or falls off, when the tag is removed from the release liner. Thus the construction of Good (or any combination of Good with the other references) cannot function in the manner claimed by Applicant.

Claim 21 has been amended to positively state the relevant limitation rather than couch it in terms of "whereby".

Reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 21 and allowance of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Harry G. Weissenberger  
Reg. No. 18,784